1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA MELVIN DUKES, 10 11 Plaintiff, No. CIV S-09-2208 DAD P 12 VS. 13 J. SELBIL, et al., Defendants. 14 ORDER 15 Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed a civil rights action pursuant 16 17 to 42 U.S.C. § 1983¹. Plaintiff has not submitted an application to proceed in forma pauperis. 18 The federal venue statute requires that a civil action, other than one based on 19 diversity jurisdiction, be brought only in "(1) a judicial district where any defendant resides, if all 20 defendants reside in the same State, (2) a judicial district in which a substantial part of the events 21 or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred, or a substantial part of property that is the subject 22 of the action is situated, or (3) a judicial district in which any defendant may be found, if there is 23 no district in which the action may otherwise be brought." 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b). 24 25 Plaintiff has used the form for a petition for a writ of habeas corpus in his initial

26

pleading filed with the court. However, he does not challenge his underlying conviction therein and the court has construed the filing as a civil rights complaint.

In this case, none of the defendants reside in this district. The claim arose in Monterey County, which is located in the Northern District of California. Therefore, plaintiff's claim should have been filed in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California. In the interest of justice, a federal court may transfer a complaint filed in the wrong district to the correct district. See 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a); Starnes v. McGuire, 512 F.2d 918, 932 (D.C. Cir. 1974). Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this matter is transferred to the United States District Court for the Northern District of California. DATED: September 4, 2009. ale A Dogol UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE DAD:md/4 duke2208.21